

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ALLYSON ROTTIERS, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CYNTHIA ROTTIERS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TIMOTHY NILES,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 30, 2000

No. 220373

Macomb Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-043414-NA

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr. and Zahra, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

We review the family court's termination decision in its entirety for clear error. *In Boursaw*, 239 Mich App 161, 169; 607 NW2d 408 (1999). We conclude the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCL 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

Allyson was originally adjudicated a temporary court ward because of respondent mother's cocaine addiction and her inability to provide Allyson with a suitable, stable, and safe home. At the time of the termination hearing, over two years later, the conditions that led to the initial adjudication still had

not been rectified. Therefore, the evidence supports termination of the respondent mother's parental rights under § 19b(3)(i). Moreover, even though only a single statutory ground is required in order to terminate parental rights, *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 629; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991), the above evidence also supported termination of respondent mother's parental rights under § 19b(3)(g) and (j). The evidence indicated that respondent mother, because of her drug addiction and inability to provide a safe, stable, suitable home, was unable to provide proper care and custody for Allyson at the time of the termination hearing and, in light of her continuing drug addiction, there was little likelihood that she would be able to do so within a reasonable period of time. Respondent mother also acknowledged that her continuing drug relapses would place Allyson at risk for harm.

Further, respondent-appellant failed to show that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5). Acknowledging the importance of the child-parent relationship, we nonetheless believe that the record supports the conclusion that the best interests of the child are served by termination of respondent-mother's parental rights. *In re Boursaw*, *supra* at 180. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra